1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 OAKLAND DIVISION 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. CR 09-00982-PJH 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 RANNI K. HILLYER, [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING **EXCLUSION OF TIME** 15 16 Defendant. 17 18 The defendant came before the Court for a trial setting on June 16, 2010. At that hearing, the case was scheduled for a further status hearing on September 1, 2010, at 10:00 a.m. 19 20 The parties agreed, and the Court found, that the time between June 16, 2010 and 21 September 1, 2010, is properly excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States 22 Code, Sections 3161(h)(7)(A) and (h)(B)(iv). The parties represent and this Court found that the 23 this delay is necessary to allow counsel for the Defendant to effectively review discovery 24 documents and to prepare for trial. The parties agree that the ends of justice served by granting 25 the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy 26 trial. 27 For the foregoing reasons, and as stated on the record at the hearing on June 16, 2010, the 28 Court HEREBY ORDERS the period between June 16, 2010 and September 1, 2010, is properly 1

excluded from the speedy trial calculation under Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1 3161(h)(7)(A) and (h)(B)(iv). 2 3 ORDER 4 For the foregoing reasons, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the period between June 16, 5 2010 and September 1, 2010, is properly excluded from the speedy trial calculation under Title 6 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(h)(7)(A) and (h)(B)(iv). The Court finds that the failure 7 to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, given the complexity of this case and effective preparation 8 9 for trial. The Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt 10 11 disposition of criminal cases. IT IS SO ORDERED IT IS SO ORDERED 12 13 Donna M. Ryu DATED: 7/6/10 14 15 United States Magistrate Judge 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

[Proposed] Order Regarding Exclusion of Time, US v. Hillyer, CR 09-00982-PJH